UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,615	03/09/2005	Jeremy Darren Krieg	659-66	9877

23117 7590 11/06/2007
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER	
JACOB, AJITH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/520,615	KRIEG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ajith Jacob	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *49-110* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *49-110* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 49-50, 52-58, 68-69, 71, 72, 75, 77, 78, 91, 94, 97 and 99-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (US 6,199,098 B1). For claim 49, Jones et al. teaches:

A link generation process executed by a computer system, including: accessing data files of a network site including a server configured to send network site content to remote clients in response to received requests from said clients, said content including static content and dynamically generated content which is generated in response to receipt of requests, at least some of said requests including parameters that determine said dynamically generated content [background teaching of the possibility of using static and dynamically generated content for the TOC node, column 2, lines 27-57]; analyzing said accessed data files (method for navigating through electronically stored information as stated in [column 3, lines 19-20 of the specifications]) to identify valid parameters for generating said dynamically generated content (dynamically generate a network page – see [column 3, lines 36-37 of the specifications]); generating, based on said analyzing, data representing encoded links for accessing said dynamically generated content (dynamically generate the network

page, and assigning the path address as a hypertextual link as taught in [column 3, lines 41-42 of the specifications]), to allow indexing (expandable, hierarchical index [column 3, line 21 of the specifications]) of said dynamically generated content; and sending said generated data to a remote client or storing said generated data in a data storage device.

For claim 50, a table of contents (TOC) with encoded links for the network site is stated in paragraph [column 3, lines 40-59 of the specifications].

Claims 52 and 53 teaches the generation of a table of contents to include one or more pages and having at least one these pages include one or more links to content of network site. The teachings in Jones et al. anticipates the use of a table of content for multiple pages, and to link at least one of those pages to other pages, as represented by nodes in paragraph [column 3, lines 40-59 of the specifications]. Claim 53 further explains the plurality of pages in the table of contents each containing one or more links to respective other pages, at least one of said pages including one or more links to content of network site. Jones et al. also teaches this extension of claim 53, explaining in detail of how the table of content (TOC) nodes are hierarchical descendants of a selected node [column 3, lines 48-59 of the specifications]. A schematic process of the upper and lower level convention of the hierarchical nodes is also denoted [Drawings, Fig. 4].

Claim 54 teaches the layout of the links in the table of contents. Links in the table of contents are said to be arranged as a hierarchy corresponding to content of network site. Jones et al. clearly teaches the dynamic generation of a network page and its

placement into the table of content nodes, making it the hierarchical descendant of another node [column 3, lines 48-55 of the specifications]. Note the use of nodes to represent links to network pages [column 3, lines 40-44 of the specifications] in Jones et al. The table of contents hierarchy can then be interactively expanded and contracted in an incremental fashion [column 3, lines 55-59 of the specifications]. This process matches the hierarchical nature of the table of contents pages stated in claim 54.

Claims 55-57 teach the generation of a link to the table of content for a script that dynamically generates content and plurality of the links. Jones et al. gives a description of a table of contents with multiple encoded links. This reference also shows the existence of a plurality of these links, represented as nodes [column 3, lines 40-46 of the specifications]. Jones et al. also teaches the use of script to dynamically generate new web page, and the script being entered into the new web page [column 6, lines 10-17 of the specifications]. Including script in the links for the pages of the table of contents was anticipated by the reference.

Claim 58 recites the data files to include at least a web server configuration file, script, or database table. Jones et al. teaches the use of scripts to extract information [column 5, lines 46-55 of the specifications].

Claim 68 states the use of scripts to determine request data for retrieving dynamically generated data. Jones et al. teaches making use of a script to dynamically generate web page [column 6, lines 10-12 of the specifications], and running the scripts upon request [column 5, lines 43-46 of the specifications].

Claim 69 states the inclusion of scripts to determine access data for accessing a database to generate dynamically generated content. Jones et al. teaches of a script that references a structure definition file which defines the overall hierarchical structure [column 5, lines 46-51 of the specifications].

Claims 71 and 72 recites the process and generation of claim 49 to be executed in response to receiving a request for content as stated in claim 71 and forwarding the translated encoded link as the response. Jones et al. teaches how the request of an end-user dynamically generates a network page in response to interactively selecting a node from the table of contents on a browser of the client [Abstract].

Claim 75 teaches the process of sending an encoded link to a remote agent to allow dynamically generated data to be indexed. Encoded link is sent back to client computer and browser computer for display as taught by Jones et al. [column 5, lines 55-57 of the specifications].

Claim 77 teaches the process wherein all servable data can be accessed via selection of any one of the links to a page. All the nodes are hierarchical and can be accessed in incremental fashion [column 5, lines 55-59 of the specifications], as stated in Jones et al. So, the reference claims access to all links from one link.

Claim 78 explains the generation of table of contents in one of HTML, XML, HCL, and sitelist.txt formats. Jones et al. teaches the dynamic generation of a HTML page specifying a hierarchical table of contents display [column 5, lines 51-55 of the specifications and figure 2, 145].

Claims 91 and 94 are component and computer readable storage medium, respectively, of claim 49. Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claims 49 for the reasons stated above.

Claim 97 is a system of claim 49, and is rejected for the same reasons as stated above. The system is defined as a content discovery module, but the process is taught by Jones et al.

Claim 100 is a system of claim 49, and is rejected for the same reasons as stated above. The system is defined as one or more content discovery module, but the process of one content discovery module is already taught by Jones et al., and thus is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 99 teaches of a system that includes a proxy server for receiving request generated in response to selecting encoded link, translating request, and forwarding the translated request to network site to access corresponding dynamically generated data. Jones et al. teaches the reception of request, the processing of request [column 5, lines 41-43 of the specifications], and dynamically generating page for transmission to the requesting party [column 5, lines 51-57 of the specifications].

3. Claims 79-86, 92 and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones et al.

For claim 79, Jones et al. teaches:

A link generation process executed by a computer system, said process including analyzing one or more data files of a network site including a server configured to send network site content to remote clients in response to received

requests from said clients, said content including static content and dynamically generated content which is generated in response to receipt of requests, at least some of said requests including parameters that determine said dynamically generated content [background teaching of the possibility of using static and dynamically generated content for the TOC node, column 2, lines 27-57]; generating, based on said analyzing, data representing at least one encoded link for retrieving dynamic content data of a hierarchical data set in response to selecting at least one encoded link including one or more parameters for generating dynamic content data [column 3, line 53 of the specifications] and being in a form suitable for an indexing agent to allow indexing of dynamic content data [Abstract]; and sending said generated data to a remote client or storing said generated data in a data storage device. Hierarchical indexing of dynamic content is taught in the abstract and the summary of Jones et al., and hierarchical sets of encoded links is represented as a table of content (TOC) of nodes also [column 3, lines 48-59 of the specifications].

Claim 80 describes a link list to content data of at least one node of hierarchical data set and including at least one encoded link. Jones et al. teaches the dynamic generation of path addresses as hyperlinks to one or more table of content nodes [column 3, lines 40-44 of the specifications], which is parallel to claim 80.

Claim 81 states the generation of links to all data in the hierarchical data set. According to the teachings of Jones et al., every dynamically generated page is assigned a hypertextual link for one or more nodes of the table of contents [column 3, lines 40-44 of

the specifications]. Subsequently, Jones et al. explains the generation of links to all data.

Claims 82-85 state that each link will include a direct link, an indirect link or both. Since Jones et al. teaches that each hypertextual link is created for one or more table of content nodes [column 3, lines 40-44 of the specifications] and since the table of contents is created in an incremental fashion [column 3, lines 55-59 of the specifications], it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to see that either a direct link, an indirect link or both could be linked to a node. The page is linked to a node [column 3, lines 40-44 of the specifications], as stated in claim 85.

Claim 86 states that the hierarchical data set should include at least one web site. Jones et al. teaches that the hierarchical table of contents could include a URL for each node [column 3, lines 28-32 of the specifications]. A person with ordinary skill in the art can conclude that a URL can be the address to a web site.

Claims 92 and 95 are component and computer readable storage medium, respectively, of claim 79. Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claims 79 for the reasons stated above.

4. Claims 89, 90, 93 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones et al.

For claim 89, Jones et al. teaches:

A link generation process including accessing data files of a network site including a server configured to send network site content to remote clients in response

to received requests from said clients, said content including static content and dynamically generated content which is generated in response to receipt of requests, at least some of said requests including parameters that determine said dynamically generated content [background teaching of the possibility of using static and dynamically generated content for the TOC node, column 2, lines 27-57]; generating encoded links for dynamic content of a network site, each of encoded links including one or more parameters for use in generating dynamic content [column 3, line 53 of the specifications] and being in a form suitable for an indexing agent to allow indexing of dynamic content [Abstract], receiving requests from an indexing agent for content of site and responding to said requests by outputting said encoded links and said dynamic content corresponding thereto for indexing [Abstract]. The encoding of links for generating dynamic content is discussed in the specifications, while the response to a request made through the user-end of the indexing agent is discussed in the abstract. Claim 90 states the generated link will either be a hyperlink, XML element, or text. Jones et al. teaches the dynamic generation of a hyperlink [column 3, lines 40-44 of the specifications].

Claims 93 (once the claim objection is fixed) and 96 are component and computer readable storage medium, respectively, of claim 79. Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 89 for the reasons stated above.

Claims 101-105 state the embedded links are in a form suitable for an indexing agent. Jones et al. teaches stored information in expandable, hierarchical index [column 3, lines 19-39], which would be suitable for an indexing agent.

Claims 106-110 state that the dynamically generated content is not linked to by other content of network site. Jones et al. teaches the client option of open and closing state of the nodes for availability to other links [column 6, lines 29-52], thus making it possible to close a node for unavailability by other links.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claims 49 and 50 above, and further in view of Steele et al. (Pub No. US 2003/0191737 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claims 49 and 50 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. differs from the claimed invention in that the table of contents contain links to dynamically generated content [column 3, lines 40-44 of the specifications] and does not teach the usage of the table of contents to fully connect contents of network site.

Steele et al. teaches of an indexing system that periodically checks for modifications made to static and dynamic pages [0063].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include static content [0063] as used in Steele et al. with the table of content already in place in the Jones et al. claimed invention. Deriving static content for table of contents is a standard step in link generation and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The motivation for combining the arts would be "for producing an index for information contained on the Internet" [0001, Steele et al.].

7. Claims 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 49 above, and further in view of Cochrane et al. (US 5,963,934 A).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 49 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. teaches the generation of encoded links with dynamic content and the contents being in a form suitable for an indexing agent [column 3, lines 40-59 of the specifications], but Jones et al. does not teach the analyzing of scripts to identify valid database query parameters and generate dynamic content.

Cochrane et al. explains the use of a query script to retrieve data from a database stored on a storage device [column 2, lines 5-11 of the specifications].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use query script to retrieve data as described in Cochrane et al. [column 2, lines 9-11 of the specifications] and generate dynamic content as taught by

Jones et al. Cochrane et al. teaches of the optimization in link generation through script, which is in the same field of invention described by Jones et al. The motivation for combining the arts would be for optimizing "the execution of the query" [column 1, lines 41-50, Cochrane et al.].

8. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 49 above, and further in view of Cochrane et al.

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 49 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. teaches the generation of encoded links with dynamic content and the contents being in a form suitable for an indexing agent [column 3, lines 40-59 of the specifications], but Jones et al. does not teach the analyzing of scripts to identify valid database query parameters and generate dynamic content or the analyzing of database tables.

Cochrane et al. explains the use of a query script to retrieve data from a database stored on a storage device [column 2, lines 5-11 of the specifications] that compiles a sequence that returns a table.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to process data from a database table as described by Cochrane et al. [column 2, lines 5-7 of the specifications] and generate dynamically generated links as described by Jones et al. Jones et al. already teaches the step of processing the data, while Cochrane et al. teaches of using a database table, which would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to see as motivation for improvement.

The motivation for combining the arts would be for optimizing "the execution of the query" [column 1, lines 41-50, Cochrane et al.].

9. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 49 above, and further in view of Steele et al. (Pub No. US 2003/0191737 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 49 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. differs from the claimed invention in that the encoded links mentioned pertains to dynamic content [column 3, lines 40-44 of the specifications] and does not teach about the encoding links for static content as taught in claim 62.

Steele et al. teaches about indexing static pages whenever the contents of a server is modified [0063].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to index static pages as taught by Steele et al. [0063], and improve the claimed invention of Jones et al. by providing indexing of links to both dynamic and static content. The motivation for combining the arts would be to bring all the pages "to a central site for processing" [0004, Steele et al.].

10. Claims 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 49 above, and further in view of Conner et al. (US 6,779,152 B1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 49 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. explicitly teaches the limitations as disclosed above except for using prefixes and suffixes to identify the types of links.

The general concept of using prefixes and suffixes to classify the type of a link is well known within the art as illustrated by Conner et al. which discloses the use of prefixes and suffixes as starting and ending HTML tags to perform a union operation on the attribute of a cell [column 9, lines 40-50 of the specifications].

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jones et al. to include the use of prefixes as taught by Conner et al. in order to indicate a type of dynamically generated content and to include the use of suffixes as taught by Conner et al. to indicate a link as belonging to the table of contents. The motivation for combining the arts would be "to convert dynamic data into a formatted tabular representation" [column 2, lines 12-29, Conner et al.].

11. Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 49 above, and further in view of Salerno et al. (WO 02/25463 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 49 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. explicitly teaches the limitations as disclosed above except for checking whether the remote agent is an indexing agent and sending a table of contents or the content itself accordingly.

The general concept of sending information to an agent based on its status is well known within the art as illustrated by Salerno et al. which discloses a method of determining the right content to be sent to a remote terminal after a request is made and making the optimal selection [Claim 1].

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jones et al. to include a process of checking to see if a remote agent is an indexing agent as taught by Salerno et al. to determine what contents should be sent to the remote agent. The improvement stated by Salerno et al. is an efficient solution for transferring valid content from a server to a remote agent. The motivation for combining the arts would be "to optimize data transfer to user clients [column 2, lines 21-32, Salerno et al.].

12. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 49 above, and further in view of McCormack et al. (Pub No. US 2002/0188680 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 49 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. explicitly teaches the limitations as disclosed above except for the links being Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) encoded.

The general concept of URI-encoding is well known within the art as illustrated by McCormack et al., which discloses the use of URIs that comprise of the specific time and information about call destinations over a web-based telephony system [0009-0010].

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jones et al. to include a process of URI-encoding a destination as taught by McCormack et al. to encode the links generated. URI-encoding is an improved encoding technique added by McCormack et al. to accomplish the same task performed by Jones et al. and thus would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in

the art. The motivation for combining the arts would be to use pass codes embedded in a URI to accept users [0016, McCormack et al.].

13. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 49 above, and further in view of Steele et al. (Pub No. US 2003/0191737 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 49 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. differs from the claimed invention in that the table of contents contain links to dynamically generated content [column 3, lines 40-44 of the specifications] and does not teach the generation of links for static content.

Steele et al. teaches of an indexing system that periodically checks for any deletion, modification, and creation of static and dynamic pages, and any of the associated links [0063].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the table of contents with links of Jones et al. to include the process described by Steele et al. which periodically checks for updates to the links. This improvement of Jones et al. reduces broken or outdated links and keeps the contents current. The motivation for combining the arts would be to bring all the pages "to a central site for processing" [0004, Steele et al.].

14. Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 49 above, and further in view of Steele et al. (Pub No. US 2003/0191737 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 49 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. differs from the claimed invention in that the table of contents contain links to dynamically generated content [column 3, lines 40-44 of the specifications] and does not teach the execution of the processing and generating steps at periodic intervals.

Steele et al. teaches of an indexing system that periodically checks for any deletion, modification, and creation of data, and any of the associated links [0063].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the table of contents with links of Jones et al. to include periodically updating system as described by Steele et al., to keep all the contents updated. The motivation for combining the arts would be to bring all the pages "to a central site for processing" [0004, Steele et al.].

15. Claims 73 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claims 49 and 72 above, and further in view of Steele et al. (Pub No. US 2003/0191737 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claims 49 and 72 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. teaches the generation of encoded links with dynamic content and the contents being in a form suitable for an indexing agent [column 3, lines 40-59 of the specifications], but Jones et al. does not teach the request to be in GET or POST form.

Steele et al. teaches the request form being either GET or POST [0278-0279].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to send and receive requests for encoded links using either GET or POST as taught by Steele et al. The transferring of data procedure suggested by

Steele et al. would have been a clear improvement for Jones et al. to one of ordinary skill in the art because they are in the same field of endeavor. The motivation for combining the arts would be "for producing an index for information contained on the Internet" [0001, Steele et al.].

16. Claim 76 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 49 above, and further in view of Steele et al. (Pub No. US 2003/0191737 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 49 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. teaches the generation of encoded links with dynamic content and the contents being in a form suitable for an indexing agent [column 3, lines 40-59 of the specifications], but Jones et al. does not teach the sending links using PUT, POST, FTP or SMTP.

Steele et al. teaches transfer using POST [0278-0279].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transfer the links of Jones et al. to a remote system using POST, as described by Steele et al. for the same reasons as stated above for claims 73 and 74. The motivation for combining the arts would be "for producing an index for information contained on the Internet" [0001, Steele et al.].

17. Claims 87 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 79 above, and further in view of Steele et al. (Pub No. US 2003/0191737 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 79 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. teaches the generation of encoded links with dynamic content and the contents being in a form suitable for an indexing agent [column 3, lines 40-59 of the specifications], but Jones et al. does not teach the encoded link including at least one encoded GET or POST query.

Steele et al. teaches the generation of dynamic content including the method of the form being either GET or POST [0279].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include at least one query for the encoded links of Jones et al. to be either GET or POST as taught by Steele et al. Steele et al. describes the form of a query resembling the request by an end-user in Jones et al. [column 3, lines 48-55 of the specifications], but suggests it through GET or POST and would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art. The motivation for combining the arts would be to bring all the pages "to a central site for processing" [0004, Steele et al.].

18. Claim 98 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. as set forth above against claim 97 above, and further in view of Steele et al. (Pub No. US 2003/0191737 A1).

Jones et al. teaches the limitations of claim 97 for the reasons above.

Jones et al. teaches the generation of encoded links with dynamic content and the contents being in a form suitable for an indexing agent [column 3, lines 40-59 of the specifications], but Jones et al. does not teach the analysis of a database by a link generator to determine parameters.

Steele et al. teaches the accessing of database to produce dynamic page [0036], and determine the parameters [0037].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the encoded links of dynamic content from Jones et al. with the accessing of database to determine parameters taught by Steele et al. Steele et al. teaches a way of improving processing of parameters to generate encoded links as taught by Jones et al., thus being obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art. The motivation for combining the arts would be to bring all the pages "to a central site for processing" [0004, Steele et al.].

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed August 1, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's argument.

Regarding claims 49-50, 52-58, 68-69, 71-72, 75, 77-78, 91, 94, 97 and 99-100, applicant argues that the Jones et al. patent (US 6,199,098 B1) does not disclose the functions of the application. Applicant states that there is no disclosure of dynamically generated content, and no disclosure of searching for servable content. Jones et al. clearly teaches the generation of dynamically generated network pages [column 3, lines 19-20] and according to definition provided by the applicant pertaining to "servable" content, it means being "capable of being served". According to Jones et al., the network page is generated for display to the end-user [column 3, lines 38-39], thus the content is in "servable" form.

The applicant argues that "the scripts, data files, databases, etc., that Jones refers to are actually part of the Jones system itself, whereas in applicant's claimed system the scripts, data files and databases are part of the network site being analyzed and thus external to the claimed system. In independent claim 49 and dependent claim 58, applicant does not claim data files to be existent in an entity separate from the server. Applicant in fact claims "data files of a network site including a server" which does not disclose a system independent from the server for the scripts, data files, database, etc. in the network site. Applicant also states the "valid parameters" for dynamically generated TOC pages are not taught by Jones, since it maybe configured by a person who setup the particular system, unlike the high degree of automation described the applicant's claims. Applicant's claims does not suggest the "valid parameters" to be determined by an automation or by a user, and Jones et al. clearly only teaches the use of address path and digital specifications to dynamically generate a network page [column 3, lines 36-37].

The applicant also argues that the processing of scripts [amended to "analyzing" of scripts] is not taught by the Jones et al. reference for claim 68. Applicant states that the processing does not just run the script, but also analyzes script to see which parameters it will accept. Jones et al. clearly teaches the analysis of the script in order to determine which TOC node to be displayed [column 6, lines 10-28].

The applicant also argues that Jones et al. does not teach the coverage of all content and does not cover all discovered content of the site as stated in claim 51. For this reason, the reference of Steele et al. was combined with Jones et al. to state the 35

U.S.C. 103 obviousness rejection maintained in the original rejection. Applicant's argument is moot, since the argument is based without consideration of the rejection clearly provided.

In light of the forgoing arguments, the 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

Conclusion

20. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajith Jacob whose telephone number is 571-270-1763. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 EST, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AJ

10/15/2007

AJ
Patent Examiner

MOHAMMAD ALI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER